

Also, petition of New York State Retail Jewelers' Association, favoring Stephens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of William S. Myers, relative to North America's need for Chilean nitrate; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Merchants' Association of New York, favoring pneumatic tubes in Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of men and women voters of Arizona and Nevada, favoring suffrage for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of District Council of Greater New York, relative to wages of employees in Canal Zone; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Samuel Smith and others, of Alameda County, Cal., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, for impartial neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of the twenty-second district of Ohio, against war with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Albert Hendrickson and 23 others, of Alma Center and Hixton, Wis., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Cotton Goods Export Association of New York and the Merchants Association of New York, against Clarke amendment to the Philippine bill; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of Merchants' Association of New York, relative to pneumatic tubes in Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Republican county committee, New York, favoring bill to pension aged employees of the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of District Council of Greater New York, relative to wages of employees in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of sundry citizens of Argyle, Ill., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of legislative committee of the E. R. Nota Club, of Streator, Ill., favoring House resolution 137, for Government inspection of dairies; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Rockford (Ill.) Central Labor Union, favoring House bill 8665, relative to regulating work of Government employees, etc.; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Italian-American Citizens' Club of Massachusetts, against Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GLYNN: Petition of H. A. Carrigan and sundry other citizens of Ansonia, Conn., favoring passage of House bill 8665; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of First Presbyterian Church of Toledo, Iowa, against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Linn County, Iowa, against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of T. G. Brobston and others, in re House bills 491, 6468, and 13778; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of R. I. Keates and others, in re House bill 652; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of R. I. Keates and others, in re House bill 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: Memorial of citizens of Tuttle, Okla., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Arapaho, Okla., favoring Federal motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of sundry citizens of Oklahoma, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Electrotype Moulders and Finishers Union No. 17, of Washington, D. C., in favor of House bill 8664; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of John Z. Speer, of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of adequate preparedness against foreign invasion of United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Max I. Amdursky, Philip Gettman, William V. Fischer, C. V. Witt, William E. Heeren, Otto Heeren, T. A. Kinman, Edward Schuck, Richard F. Krumm, John Logiodice, and K. F. Stahl, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., opposed to United States

becoming embroiled in European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NORTH: Memorial of D. B. McCreary, of Saltsburg, Pa., favoring a tax on all exportation of gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Casper G. Decker, of Elmira, N. Y., favoring appropriation of \$250,000 for Government schools for Sioux Indian children, and also favoring military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of William H. Bilbrough, of Elmira, N. Y., favoring a large body of citizen soldiery, as embodied in section 56 of the Chamberlain military bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Charles Gaiss, Henry Otto Hauptmann, Joseph Sidoti, David Wasson, John C. Meyer, J. W. Eyesenberger, Rudolph Buckinger, Valentine Remmel, Cassius G. Andrew, Ed. Kelce, G. J. Seibel, Otto F. Vollgraf, Edward Palmer, Jr., Valentine Rettig, W. Campbell, Miles T. Terrill, F. J. Bantley, William W. Arland, John N. Illig, Frank K. Gaiss, John S. Edminster, M. L. Russ, and Joseph Eck, all of Corning, N. Y.; E. E. Rogers and H. J. Swartwood, of Painted Post, N. Y.; and W. A. Caveney, Fred G. Johnson, F. A. Abbey, A. Hohl, and Leonard R. Bell, all of Brookton, N. Y., in favor of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of H. C. Rietmann, F. I. Lyons, P. G. Schug, William J. Finnegan, John Hammerstrom, N. H. Cooper, Grant Nelson, L. H. Brunt, and John J. Henley, all of Elmira, N. Y., favoring House bill 8665; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of California, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of Andrew Jackson Democratic Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the Penrose and Griffin bills; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of committee on military lectures, in re preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., indorsing the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Clifton Motor Works, of Cincinnati, Ohio, in re House bill 9411; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SANFORD: Papers to accompany House bill 14936, for the relief of Lawrence Collois; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of New Hampshire, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of residents of Boulder County, Colo., protesting against the passage of House bill 652, to provide for the Sunday closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 27, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come to Thee amid the abounding light of this springtime. Open our hearts to Thee for the more abounding light of Thy grace. We remember the fruit of the spirit that is righteousness, joy, and peace. We pray that all of the fullness of Thy spirit may be revealed in us, that we may have all the qualities that will impart and maintain the diviner and higher life among men. Guide us this day. Through us do Thou fulfill Thy purpose in this great Nation. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

Almeron E. Calkins *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 417);
Henry T. Whitaker *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 418);
and

Claude L. Holt, son and sole heir of Lucius E. B. Holt, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 419).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BRADY. I present resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, regarding arbitration of

the railway strike in the Northwest. I ask that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO.

Resolution regarding arbitration between railroads and their employees adopted by Coeur d'Alene Chamber of Commerce, April 17, 1916.

Whereas the public of the Pacific Northwest will suffer great inconvenience and disastrous effect will fall upon the lumber, mining, grain, and other industries in the event of interruption of public service by a general strike, such as is threatened by the railway trainmen's organization; and

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has taken action looking to an adjustment by arbitration of the issues in controversy; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Coeur d'Alene Chamber of Commerce, That in the interest of public convenience and the welfare of the Pacific Northwest industries, we urge that both parties to the controversy adjust their difficulties without recourse to extreme measures that will suspend the public service; and be it

Resolved, That we commend the effort of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to indorse arbitration, and the attitude of the railway managers in signifying their willingness to submit to arbitration; and be it

Resolved, That the secretary of the Coeur d'Alene Chamber of Commerce be, and is hereby directed, to communicate this resolution to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

H. A. SAMPSON, *President*.

Approved:

C. L. DITTMORE, *Secretary*.

Mr. BRADY presented petitions of sundry citizens of Idaho, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina presented petitions of sundry citizens of South Carolina, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SAULSBURY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Harrington, Del., praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. STERLING presented petitions of sundry citizens of South Dakota, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of Major Frank M. Foots Camp, No. 3, United Spanish War Veterans, of Wyoming, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish-American War, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PHELAN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Oakland, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 389, International Longshoremen's Association, of San Diego, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Juvenile Protective Association of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maine, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DU PONT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Harrington, Del., praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., remonstrating against the proposed creation of a juvenile court in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Colonel H. C. Gilbert Camp, No. 50, Sons of Veterans, of Coldwater, Mich., praying for an increase in armaments, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ROBINSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Arkansas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of De Queen, Ark., praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the Rural Delivery Service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. PITTMAN. I present a petition of the Civic League of Reno, Nev., favoring the adoption of the Susan B. Anthony woman-suffrage amendment. I ask that the petition may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by Reno Women's Civic League, April 18, 1916.

Whereas we, as women voters of Nevada, realize the injustice done to the women of the Nation, to whom political rights are denied, and the necessity that this wrong should be righted by the Nation in the quickest possible way: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Reno Civic League, at a meeting held at Reno on Tuesday, April 18, call upon the Judiciary Committee of the House for an immediate and favorable report of the Susan B. Anthony amendment, and urge Congress to submit the same to the States during the present session: And be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the meeting be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States; Senator KERN, the majority leader of the Senate; and Senator GALLINGER, the minority leader; Hon. CHAMP CLARK, the Speaker of the House; Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, majority leader of the House; Hon. JAMES MANN, minority leader; to every member of the House Judiciary Committee; and our Representatives in Congress.

MINNIE FLANIGAN, *President*.
BESSIE MOFFET, *Secretary*.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Portland, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was ordered to lie on the table.

ACTIVITIES OF AMERICAN EMBARGO CONFERENCE.

Mr. HUSTING. Mr. President, I have here some letters and some telegrams sent to me which I think might be of interest to the Senate and to the people. I first want to offer about a thousand letters which I received some time in February and ask to have the Secretary read one of them. They are all identical. The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMOOT. What is the request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To read one. The Chair hears no objection, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

MONTELO, WIS., February 14, 1916.

HON. PAUL O. HUSTING,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a citizen of the State of Wisconsin, I am addressing this appeal to you, as my representative in the upper House of Congress, to support the resolution placing an embargo upon the further shipment of arms and ammunition to the belligerent nations of Europe.

I note in the public prints that you are pointing to the speech delivered by United States Senator REED on January 10 and that you are quoted as writing to your constituents that the position he (Senator REED) takes on the question of an embargo "expresses" your sentiment in the matter and that the arguments he advances appear to you to be unanswerable.

May I call your attention to the editorial printed in the Milwaukee Free Press Wednesday morning, January 12, and may I take the liberty of asking you to point out to me where the Free Press and not Senator REED is in the wrong?

May I also ask, as the Free Press asks, why Senator REED did not point out that the Wilson administration had all along the weapon with which to bring Great Britain to time—the threat of an embargo on arms and ammunition?

May I also call your attention to the fact that Senator REED is reported as saying in his Milwaukee speech that "unless England makes reparation for confiscation of American goods" and unless this "will have effect within 60 days" he will be one of the first to vote for an embargo, and may I ask if you are joining with Senator REED in voicing this declaration?

I would point out to you that the large majority of the Wisconsin congressional delegation is in favor of the embargo resolution. Senator LA FOLLETTE is for it and Congressmen CARY, BROWNE, STAFFORD, BURKE, ESCH, KONOP, and COOPER are reported for it, and I feel that these men are convinced that their constituents want an embargo, and with this the situation in our State, I repeat my request that you give the embargo resolution your support.

I am very earnest in making this plea to you and ask that you be good enough to favor me with a reply. If you will do so I would like to have you give me some facts supporting your stand against the embargo other than your general reference to general statements that may have appeared in the newspapers.

Thanking you for an early reply, I am,

Very truly, yours,

GUSTAV WESELOB.

Mr. HUSTING. Mr. President, I also received in due course of mail a letter which I hold in my hand not addressed to me but evidently sent to me by some one whose name appears in the left-hand corner. I should like to have the Secretary read it, omitting the name in the left-hand corner.

ALL READY FOR THE SIGNATURE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE AMERICAN EMBARGO CONFERENCE,

139 North Clark Street, Chicago, February 9, 1916.

DEAR SIR: Taking the liberty of assuming that you are heartily in favor of any move that might hasten the end of the war and the slaughter of humans in Europe, and that therefore you are in favor of the movement to have an embargo declared upon the further shipment of arms and ammunition to any of the belligerents, we are taking the liberty of writing to you and asking whether you will join with us in the effort being made to induce United States Senator PAUL O. HUSTING,

of your State, to join with practically all of the other members of the Wisconsin congressional delegation in their work to bring about such an embargo.

Believing that you feel with the hundreds of thousands of our members that the United States should at least have no hand in the war, and should not be reaping a harvest of blood-stained money, and that you stand for a real and genuine neutrality for this Nation, we are sending you with this letter some letters addressed to Senator HUSTING.

These letters are ready to be dated and signed and then should be placed in separate envelopes and mailed as personal letters to Hon. PAUL O. HUSTING, United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

We would be glad if you were able to get some of the voters to write personal letters, but the big thing is to have all letters possible sent to Mr. HUSTING at the earliest possible moment.

If you think it would be a better plan to have all of the letters signed and then left with you and you would then have them forwarded in separate envelopes to Senator HUSTING, we would consider this a very great assistance on your part and would be very glad to reimburse you for the postage and envelopes.

We sincerely hope that you are with this effort to secure the embargo and that you will do all in your power to aid the movement. If you could use more of the letters, please let us know, and we will forward you as many as you think you can have signed. We are sending you a circular letter showing you the latest developments in the campaign.

Will you please be good enough to let us know just what assistance in this manner you can give us?

Thanking you for giving this your attention, we are, with best wishes,

Very sincerely, yours,

THE AMERICAN EMBARGO CONFERENCE,
WILL R. MACDONALD, Secretary.

Mr. HUSTING. Mr. President, I received these letters in February, and also this one. I did not then appreciate the full significance of it. I did not believe, or at least I thought it would not be advisable for me to bring it to the attention of the Senate. I thought perhaps that the matter might die out; that there was no need of stirring up the undertow of our foreign relations with another country. I understood it was the policy not to discuss these matters. I am in hearty accord with that policy; but, in connection with what has been happening recently and is happening now, I consider it quite relevant now to discuss the matter, especially because of this telegraphic campaign that is now being carried on in opposition to the Government's position.

In this letter it will be noticed there are several things which are quite significant, especially that part calling on the Wisconsin Senator to make him line up and work with the rest of the Wisconsin delegation; and it shows that that campaign was carried out with some thoroughness, because I have had about 1,000 identical letters sent to me. These letters are printed with my address on them. They are all identical. There is no difference between them, even to the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i." The date and the place of signature are left blank, but aside from that the letter is absolutely complete, and the purpose is quite clearly stated in this letter; that is, to get me to line up with the rest of Wisconsin's representatives.

This emanated from Chicago, not from Wisconsin; and thus these thousand letters were placed in the hands of Wisconsin citizens for them to express, not their own sentiments, but the sentiments of some bureau or bureau clerk in Chicago, and back of him the person or institution or influence fomenting the propaganda and paying the bills.

Further he states as follows:

These letters are ready to be dated and signed, and then should be placed in separate envelopes and mailed as personal letters to Hon. PAUL O. HUSTING, United States Senator, Washington, D. C., designating them as "personal letters."

It shows the intention to deceive the representative from Wisconsin in the belief that he was getting the personal sentiments of Wisconsin citizens.

I must confess that they were not paying their representative a very good compliment when they thought he would be deceived into the belief that they were personal letters, because these thousand letters were all printed on the same paper, with the same contents, and with the same appearance, and sent in envelopes duly stamped and which were identical in appearance and substance. The clerks in my office knew the contents before they ever opened them by the appearance of the envelopes; but at least the intent was there to deceive.

Now, they also

urged you to get some of your neighbors to write personal letters to the Senator, but the big thing is to have all the letters sent to Mr. HUSTING at the earliest possible moment.

At that time there was a good deal of talk about an embargo. I think it was about the time when the embargo petitions were exhibited here in the Senate, and it was considered to be a good time to influence and overwhelm a representative of Wisconsin. Now, they make a further suggestion:

If you think it would be a better plan to have all of the letters signed and then left with you, and you would then have them forwarded in separate envelopes to Senator HUSTING, we would consider this a very great assistance on your part, and would be very glad to reimburse you for the postage and envelopes.

All they wanted was to have our citizens express the sentiments of the propagandists, and they were willing to pay the

bills! All they asked of the citizens of Wisconsin was their cooperation in attempting to deceive their Senator!

The supply of letters was inexhaustible. As you will observe from the letter, they agree to send as many more as their correspondents might be able to secure signatures for. The supply was equal to the number of all citizens who were willing to put their hand down to a manufactured letter which they could sign and put it into an envelope which had already been addressed and with a stamp that had already been paid for.

Here is more that is significant:

We are sending you a circular letter showing you the latest developments in the campaign.

What campaign? The campaign of the American Embargo Conference and those back of that conference, a campaign of intimidation, a campaign to influence a representative of the people of the United States to vote against his own convictions!

THE SUBSIDIZED TELEGRAMS.

Now, as I said, these letters date back as far as February. I did not think it worth while to bring that to the attention of the Senate then, but some things are now occurring which come from the same malevolent source as the letters, which bear the same label, are of the same handiwork, initiated by the same influences, paid by the same money.

I have been favored with a great many telegrams from constituents in Wisconsin, and when I know that those telegrams are sent in good faith and are an honest expression of an honest opinion I think they are entitled to a great deal of respect and consideration. This is a country where everyone has a right not only to believe but to express his personal belief and to petition Congress at all times. But I began to receive these telegrams in such numbers and found such striking similarity between them, notwithstanding identical dates and from places far distant from one another, that I took the trouble to have my secretary inspect telegrams of other Senators. I took the liberty of having my secretary examine hundreds of telegrams received by Senators all over the United States, and there have been plenty of them introduced here, and I found this to be the fact, that telegrams emanating from places thousands of miles apart and dated on the same day were identical in form even to repeating an error which I found in the telegraphic forms which I shall hereafter show you.

These were dated April 24 from States like Wisconsin, and, for that matter, from many points in Wisconsin, 200 or 300 miles apart, from Illinois, from Missouri, from Indiana, from New York, from Ohio, are not only similar in character but absolutely identical word for word, and as I have said before, repeating grammatical errors in the original form. I have assorted these telegrams and have taken them from the above-named States and find them in the various forms in identical terms. I have them here, and for the purpose of not confusing them I have numbered them. Here is No. 1. It comes from Norwalk, Wis., dated April 25, addressed to "Hon. PAUL O. HUSTING, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.":

[Telegram No. 1.]

Your constituents urge and expect you to stand like a rock against the passing frenzy of insane and criminal folly on the part of the small portion of interested persons who are clamoring for war. We want peace. Nothing warrants any other action.

Apparently a spontaneous conviction passing into the mind of some constituent, and, in the absence of any proof to the contrary, it would naturally indicate his own sentiments. But here we have one from Fond du Lac, bearing the same date, saying:

Your constituents urge and expect you to stand like a rock against the passing frenzy of insane and criminal folly on the part of the small portion of interested persons who are clamoring for war. We want peace. Nothing warrants any other action.

Here is one from another part of the State to the same effect.

I will read some a little later.

Here is No. 2, from West Salem, Wis.:

[Telegram No. 2.]

Will you let me reassure you that the great majority of your constituents stand for peace, believe war now unnecessary and uncalled for, and will resent being participated into the European conflict?

Here is one from Fond du Lac, same date, 250 miles away:

Will you let me reassure you that the great majority of your constituents stand for peace, believe war now unnecessary and uncalled for, and will resent being participated into the European conflict?

Here are two others with the word "participated," repeating the mistake of the man who sat in his office in Chicago and made a slip over the typewriter or did not know how to spell "precipitated."

Here is No. 3:

As to-day's reports indicate that this country is likely to be rushed into the European war, let me assure you that I and your constituents who will be the real sufferers will bitterly resent anything but calm action, and calm action means peace continuing.

That was on April 25. Here is one from St. Louis, dated April 25, which I shall read—telegram No. 3:

As to-day's reports indicate that this country is likely to be rushed into the European war, let me assure you that I and your constituents will be the real sufferers, and will bitterly resent anything but calm action, and calm action means peace continuing.

St. Louis and Wisconsin! Fond du Lac and Missouri!

Here is No. 4: I want to call your attention to it. I will read these telegrams, because of all of the telegrams coming from most small towns no two are alike. They did not give the same telegram to the same man in the same small town, but had a collection of telegrams, and gave each one to a different man in the same town, of course, so that their representatives could not discover that there was any concerted action there; but to make it appear that these telegrams were a spontaneous expression of something that had just occurred to each separately because of recent events. Before I get through I want to show the Senate how these things were provided and arranged for. Now, here is another:

Other constituents of yours join with me in informing you that we believe the great masses of the people resent being dragged into war, that we must consider unnecessary. We appeal to you to lift your voice in opposing steps leading to war.

Here is another from another State far away:

Other constituents of yours join with me in informing you that we believe the great masses of the people resent being dragged into war, that we must consider unnecessary. We appeal to you to lift your voice in opposing steps leading to war.

Here is form No. 5 from Milwaukee; here is one from Fond du Lac; here is another one from a State far away, in identical language:

Your constituents joining with me in sending this message are deeply alarmed by rumors that this country is near to being plunged into the European war. You know your constituents want peace, and we emphatically urge that you so express our sentiments. We know we can depend upon you.

That is from Kewaunee; another one from Fond du Lac; one from St. Nazianz; one from Wausau; one from Ripon, Wis., and one from Illinois and several from other States. I will just read one:

Your constituents joining with me in sending this message are deeply alarmed by rumors that this country is near to being precipitated into the European war. You know your constituents want peace, and we emphatically urge that you so express our sentiments. We know we can depend upon you.

I want to call the Senate's attention particularly to this question of rumors, because the rumors, apparently from the text of these telegrams, are of recent origin. There is another telegram from Fond du Lac containing form No. 6. Here is another one in what are called forms No. 7 and No. 8.

I have refrained from reading all of these telegrams, but those sorted according to number are absolutely identical in form, and I am informed by other Senators that telegrams identical in form have come from points all over the United States.

MADE-TO-ORDER "RUMORS OF WAR."

It is true that if the people of the United States were suddenly alarmed by rumors that were being spread by an intention on the part of this Government to plunge us into war, it might be alarming, and we would not be surprised to be overwhelmed with telegrams expressing the sentiment of the people—and it is the sentiment of the people—that they do not want any war. But the cruelty and the cunning of these telegrams is that they were framed perhaps weeks ahead of this crisis, and I shall show you later, and the foul thought is being implanted in the minds of United States citizens, and citizens of my State, and I have no doubt in the minds of other citizens, that this administration is, in fact, seeking to plunge this country into war. *But what will you say of conduct, what will you say of a practice, which puts into the mouths of honest, decent citizens of my State and of the United States words and suspicions that are not founded on fact, but founded on something that has been handed to them by some one else living away out of the State, by some party, hired by who knows what or whom?*

After all, I want to cover this matter as fully as possible, and I hope that I shall not say anything that will in any way embarrass our Government in this matter. The only purpose of my dwelling upon this subject at all is merely in the interest of peace. I believe that the best way to preserve peace is for the people of the United States to get right squarely back of their Government and to sustain that Government in every crisis which comes to it; and I am only talking now in the hope of exposing a plot which, in its very nature, if long continued must bring us into serious trouble—if not with foreign countries, with the people of our own country. *It is high time that the people who are being duped should know that they are being duped; that the masks be torn from the faces of those who*

pretend to be in the interest of peace, and in the garb of a peace-maker are endeavoring to stir up dissension and insurrection in our own country by these methods; and these methods are calculated to bring about that very result.

After collecting these telegrams, thinking that I had made a fairly satisfactory showing, at least to myself, I was fortunate enough to have presented to me some things which throw additional light on this campaign which is being now carried on. You have seen the articles in the World, in the Times, and in some of the other papers—the Herald, I believe, the Sun, and other New York papers—you have seen there that a certain secretary of the American Embargo Conference asked the newspaper men to give him publicity. I understand that the very man who asked them to give him such publicity is the man who stated that he was going to "pull off," so I have been reliably informed, "the biggest publication stunt that was ever pulled off in the United States." This secretary is the secretary, or at least is connected with the concern which I hope to show you not only sends out these telegrams, but which does something more, namely, pays for them.

I hold in my hand an original copy of blank-form telegrams. From a letter which I shall hereafter read you will learn that this blank telegraphic form was sent from the American Embargo Conference, located at Chicago. I am going to read this blank telegraphic form together with the directions at the top, and by comparing these forms with telegrams I have just read you will observe that Telegram No. 1 is identical with Form No. 1, that Telegram No. 2 is identical with Form No. 2, and so forth.

THE FORM TELEGRAMS.

Now, telegrams that have been received by various Members of Congress almost invariably follow the form of the "form" telegrams on the following sheet, even repeating typographical and grammatical errors of the form.

Here is the sheet of blank-form telegrams:

Please sign one of these telegrams and have voters each sign one telegram. Cross off the telegrams that are not signed and then hold this sheet until we wire you to telegraph it. Then please send it without delay.

NIGHT LETTER.

_____, 1916.

Hon. _____,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Your constituents urge and expect you to stand like a rock against the passing frenzy of insane and criminal folly on the part of the small portion of interested persons who are clamoring for war. We want peace. Nothing warrants any other action.

(Address) _____,

NIGHT LETTER.

_____, 1916.

Hon. _____,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

If warlike rumors coming from Washington are true, will you let me assure you that the great majority of your constituents stand for peace, believe war now unnecessary and uncalled for, and will resent being PARTICIPATED into the European conflict.

(Address) _____,

NIGHT LETTER.

_____, 1916.

Hon. _____,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

As to-day's reports indicate that this country is likely to be rushed into the European war, let me assure you that I and your constituents, who will be the real sufferers, will bitterly resent anything but calm action, and calm action means peace continuing.

(Address) _____,

NIGHT LETTER.

_____, 1916.

Hon. _____,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Other constituents of yours join with me in informing you that we believe the great masses of the people will resent being dragged into a war that we must consider unnecessary. We appeal to you to lift your voice in opposing steps leading to war.

(Address) _____,

NIGHT LETTER.

_____, 1916.

Hon. _____,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Your constituents, joining with me in sending this message, are deeply alarmed by rumors that this country is near to being plunged into the European war. You know your constituents want peace, and we emphatically urge that you so express our sentiments. We know we can depend upon you.

(Address) _____,

NIGHT LETTER.

_____, 1916.

Hon. _____,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The wives and mothers in your district, who will suffer most if the war comes, urge me to appeal to you to do all possible to block warlike sentiment agitated by those who will not suffer. Your constituents see no reason for ending our peace.

(Address) _____.

NIGHT LETTER.

_____, 1916.

Hon. _____,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Your constituents, joining with me in sending this message, are deeply alarmed by rumors that this country is near to being plunged into the European war. You know your constituents want peace, and we emphatically urge that you so express our sentiments. We know that we can depend upon you.

(Address) _____.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HUSTING. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, in line with the argument of the Senator from Wisconsin, I want simply to state in this connection that I received this morning a number of telegrams dated at Kansas City, Mo., but evidently most of the signers residing in Kansas City, Kans., 35 of the telegrams being identical with No. 1, which the Senator has read; 27 of them being identical with No. 2; 15 of them being identical with No. 3; 9 being identical with No. 4; 30 identical with No. 5; and 20 corresponding identically with No. 6, showing clearly that they were inspired from the same source as those received by the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. HUSTING. I should like to ask the Senator whether, in the telegrams coming from small towns, he found any two alike or whether they were not different telegrams?

Mr. THOMPSON. These all came from the same place, being dated at Kansas City, Mo.; but I am acquainted with most of the signers, and they reside in Kansas City, Kans. I have only one little, lone telegram from an outside town, evidently voluntarily sent by the sender himself, as it is couched in entirely different language.

Mr. GORE. No. 5 seems to be the favorite.

WHO HAS KEPT THE PEACE?

Mr. HUSTING. Yes; No. 5 seems to be the favorite.

It was rumored that the Republic might be plunged into war. Rumored when? To read these telegrams it would appear that the rumor had just started; that word had just gone out that the President of the United States desired to plunge this country into war, when, as a matter of fact, the telegrams had been lying on the desks of the senders for weeks, and perhaps months, waiting for the time when they should be rushed to the telegraph office and be sent to Senators and Representatives in Congress at a time which they then already anticipated would come, as though they were the creation of the moment, as though they were expressing the opinion of the moment.

The President had kept us out of war under the most trying and difficult circumstances for nearly a year and a half. Who else has helped to keep us out of war thus far? Certainly not the belligerent powers, who have trampled upon our rights, who have killed our citizens on the high seas, and who are now obstructing our commerce. Nor have their sympathizers kept us out of war. Our rights have been violated by all of the belligerent nations, by the entente allies as well as the Germanic allies. Suffice it to say that our rights have been trampled upon and a hundred things have occurred, each one of them sufficient under ordinary circumstances and conditions to have precipitated us into war, if instead of a peace-loving President we would have had an impulsive and warlike President, and yet we have had no war. Who kept us out of war? Who was here from March 4, 1915, until December, 1915, to bear the heavy responsibility of maintaining our honor and keeping the peace? Congress was not in session. There were no warning resolutions; there was no necessity to warn the President; there is no necessity to warn him now to keep us out of war. There was an attempt made here to warn our citizens from traveling on the high seas, because such action on their part might perchance get us into trouble with Germany; but I should like to know whether the same men—and I am speaking of the country at large—who favored warning our citizens not to travel upon the high seas for fear we might thereby become involved in trouble with some foreign Government would have been or are now in favor of issuing a warning to the shippers of the products of this country—cotton, wheat, wool, anything, if you please—not to ship their goods across the high seas for fear that it would get us

into trouble! Who would have had us warn our citizens to abandon all of our commerce for fear we might get into trouble with the other powers? It was the administration now representing our Government that has kept us at peace, as all the world knows!

POISONERS OF PUBLIC OPINION.

I am only saying this in passing, because the President of the United States has exerted every patriotic effort that he could to keep us out of trouble, and I resent it as a base insinuation and foul slander upon our Government for anyone to intimate or charge that the President of the United States has any idea in his mind except to preserve the peace of this country, if he can do so with honor to ourselves.

And what shall we say of a conspiracy financed by money from some mysterious source to slander and to bring the President of the United States into the hatred and contempt of his fellow citizens in the manner referred to?

So I say we have a peace-loving President, who has been criticized, on the one hand, because he is too peace loving, who has kept us out of war all this time, and, on the other hand, we find him charged, through the instrumentality of some organization, using the citizens of this country as its messengers, with attempting to plunge this Nation into the maelstrom of war. Here we find a deep-laid plot to poison the minds of his fellow citizens all over the country into the belief that the President wants war when every fact gives the lie to such assertion!

I say this is being done by this mysterious "embargo conference," this embargo conspiracy, I have not gotten through with it yet; and I want to come to the point now of showing conclusively to any fair mind that this propaganda, these 200,000 telegrams, are not only being sent out from a common head but they are being paid for by this same head.

THE TELL-TALE LETTER.

You will notice at the head of this blank form the holders are instructed to procure signers at once and hold the same subject to further orders, and I have already shown that these must have been in the hands of holders, who appear to have been part of the organization, for weeks or perhaps months. The word came to these procurers in the letters of April 24, namely, Monday of this week, as will appear from one of these letters which I will read into the RECORD and comment on in detail.

[The American Embargo Conference (Incorporated), Room 905, 139 North Clark Street (City Hall Square Building), Chicago. Telephone, Randolph 3189. Col. Jasper Tucker Darling, president, chairman of the executive committee; W. R. McDonald, general manager; J. H. Forrest, secretary; C. Hjalmar Lundquist, secretary; William D. Falk, treasurer.]

APRIL 24, 1916.

DEAR SIR: Feeling confident that as one of the patriotic citizens of the United States you are anxious to see this country held out of the present terrible war in Europe, we are making this extraordinary appeal to you because we know from the most positive information that it is possible to be obtained at this time that the situation warrants it.

We can not find words strong enough to tell you of the gravity of the situation, and we assure you in the most earnest manner possible that the only way in which this country can keep from becoming involved is an immediate and great expression of the real sentiment of the people of the country who want peace.

We also most solemnly assure you that it is too late to mail an expression of this sentiment to Washington. It must be telegraphed. We have prepared night-letter telegrams that are ready to be signed by the voters. At the top of these sheets we asked that you hold these sheets until we give you notice to telegraph them. Now, we ask that you have the night letters signed as rapidly as possible and that you send them from the telegraph offices without a moment's delay.

Do not wait for any further word from us. Conditions are now even more serious and the messages should be sent at once. They should all be in Washington by Wednesday.

We beg that you will realize how grave we consider the situation to be when we assure you that we are to pay for all of the messages. All that we urge you to do is to get the telegrams signed and send them at once. Then send the bills to us and a check will be mailed to you immediately. We know what you have done in the past to help keep this country in a neutral position, and we know that at this, the most critical time in the diplomatic negotiations, you will not fail to act for us.

Only believe that our information is of the best and send the telegrams now. Please let us depend upon you in this crisis.

Thanking you for what we know you will do and repeating the assurance that we will pay for all expenses incurred, we beg to remain,

Most earnestly, yours,

THE AMERICAN EMBARGO CONFERENCE.

You will observe that the letterhead on the above letter is the same as the letterhead on the letter I received in February. Now you have heard the letter read. Let me call your attention to some of the details of this letter.

Let me call your attention to this:

We can not find words strong enough to tell you of the gravity of the situation, and we assure you in the most earnest manner possible that practically the only thing that will keep this country from becoming involved is an immediate and great expression of the real sentiment of the people of the country who want peace. We also most solemnly assure you that it is too late to mail an expression of this sentiment to Washington. It must be telegraphed—

I am reading now from this circular letter dated April 24, 1916, last Monday. It says, "It is too late to mail"—

It must be telegraphed. We have prepared night letter telegrams that are ready to be signed by the voters. At the top of these sheets we asked that you hold these sheets until we gave you notice to telegraph them.

Let me read further:

We also most solemnly assure you that it is too late to mail an expression of this sentiment to Washington. It must be telegraphed. We have prepared night-letter telegrams that are ready to be signed by the voters. At the top of these sheets we asked that you hold these sheets until we gave you notice to telegraph them. Now we ask that you have the night letters signed as rapidly as is possible and that you send them from the telegraph offices without a moment's delay. Don't wait for any further word from us. Conditions are now even more serious and the messages should be sent at once. They should all be in Washington by Wednesday—

The flood of telegrams that came in yesterday was in response to the American Embargo Conference, sitting at Chicago, and directing the transmission of hundreds of thousands of telegrams all over the United States, identical in terms, and all prepared in advance and held subject to order as directed. I read further:

We beg that you will realize how grave we consider the situation to be when we assure you that we are to pay for all of the messages. All that we urge you to do is to get the telegrams signed and send them at once. Then send the bills to us and a check will be mailed to you immediately. We know what you have done in the past to help keep this country in a neutral position, and we know that at this the most critical time in the diplomatic negotiations you will not fail to act for us.

Now, just for a moment let us take up this expression:

We know what you have done in the past to help . . . us.

What does that indicate? It indicates that previous orders of this kind have gone out and have been duly executed by these same men who are now procuring the execution and sending of these telegrams.

We know what you have done in the past. . . . the most critical time in the diplomatic negotiations.

Now, listen to this, Senators:

Only believe that our information is of the best and send the telegrams now. Please let us depend upon you in this crisis.

Thanking you for what we know you will do and repeating the assurance that we will pay for all expense incurred, we beg to remain,

Most earnestly, yours,

THE AMERICAN EMBARGO CONFERENCE.

WHO PAYS THE BILLS?

Now, just note this phrase:

We know what you have done in the past to help keep this country in a neutral position, and we know that at this, the most critical time in the diplomatic negotiations, you will not fail to act for us.

Who is "us"? I want to say now that it should be determined, by an investigation of some kind, who is "us." Who pays for these telegrams? Who pays for this bureau? Who pays for the man they get to fetch and carry in every little hamlet in the country? Who is "us" who puts this foul stuff into the mouths, the hearts, and the hands of the President's fellow citizens? I want to know who "us" is. I want to know who is paying for the couple of hundred thousands of telegrams. If there is any proper tribunal, any proper department, any proper committee of any kind, let them find out who "us" is, and find out who is paying these bills, and find out how they are acting for "us"—American citizens employed to act for "us," as though there were some outside force wanted to be helped at the hands of American citizens.

I shall not stop to read these newspapers, but one of them says here:

"By noon to-day," said one of the officers, "50,000 telegrams will have been sent from Chicago, 25,000 from St. Louis, 20,000 from Cincinnati, 20,000 from Milwaukee, 15,000 from Detroit, 15,000 from Cleveland, and lesser amounts from smaller cities throughout the country."

Messages running up into the hundreds of thousands of dollars are being sent out of Chicago from the embargo conference, expressly worded to give them the appearance of a spontaneous expression of public sentiment, when in fact they have been deliberately procured and have been lying in cold storage for a month or more.

WHY THIS PROPAGANDA?

There are some other things that I should like to know. I should like to know what this person means by saying "our information is of the best." The United States had sent its message to Germany. There was nothing more to be given out from Washington, from the White House, and here they say that this is "the gravest crisis in the history of all our negotiations," and that their "information is of the best." Are they already foretelling, I want to know, the reply that we are going to get to our note? Do they pretend to know what Germany is going to do in reply to our note? Why, what is the object, I ask, of sending these telegrams here after our mes-

sage has been transmitted to Europe and before we have received a reply? What useful purpose is it going to serve?

If, as I said before, these letters were the spontaneous expression of hundreds of thousands of people who wanted to keep us out of war, would this Chicago headquarters cause their telegrams to come in at a time when the decision is hanging in the balance over in Berlin? Do they think for a moment that two hundred or three hundred thousand telegrams that have been sent here by citizens of the United States protesting, in effect, against our Government's action are going to persuade a foreign Government to yield to our rightful and just demands? Or are they better calculated, I want to ask, to strengthen another country in the belief that we, as Americans, recognize the justice of their claims and thus to give them timely advice that they need not yield to us, because, in the event that they do not yield to us, then we will yield to them?

I say I can not see what useful purpose these telegrams can serve at this time. I can see, perhaps, that they might have served a useful purpose if an unfavorable answer had been returned to the message of the President and when it was a question of war or peace, but the immediate question that is up now is not war or peace. The immediate question that is up now before us is whether Germany is going to yield or whether we are going to yield; and here we have two or three hundred thousand citizens of the United States, by procurement of a hostile agency, publicly expressing in effect the idea that we are in the wrong and that Germany is in the right. I want to ask whether they believe, when they sent those telegrams here, that they are going to be helpful to the country in keeping us out of war and in maintaining peace? Or is it perhaps the case that these procurers and some of the senders even wish or hope that the submarine warfare may be continued in order to compel us to yield to the universal sentiment for peace and let a foreign country go on with its shocking and horrifying work?

WHAT IS THIS EMBARGO CONFERENCE?

I should like to know how this organization was initiated, how it was and is being financed, and what powers or influences are back of it. Remember that the letter dated April 24, which I have read to you, declared that it was necessary to have these telegrams in the hands of Senators and Representatives by Wednesday. April 24 was Monday, and these telegrams were received here on Wednesday to the number of two or three hundred thousand. I am informed that these telegrams came from every nook and corner in the United States and arrived here on schedule time according to the directions on the top of the blank telegraphic forms.

In other words, the string was pulled in Chicago on Monday. The response came on Wednesday in the shape of hundreds of thousands of telegrams from every part of the United States. What organization in the United States can equal that record? Is it even possible for either of the great political parties or for the United States Government itself to equal it?

Now, Mr. President, this is no common, irresponsible organization, but one carefully and scientifically organized. There is more to this than the names of the insignificant men appearing on the letterhead; and so I say I want to know who is the builder of this organization, who or what is the moving spirit of it, and what is its sinister end.

I should like to have the roster of American citizens who are lending themselves to the execution of the ultimate design and purpose of this organization, and I should also like to have their names published in the press of the Nation so that we may know who they are.

These are among the thoughts that have occurred to me. No good can come of this publication of American differences; and I want to say, at least, as one Member of the Senate—and I hope I am expressing the unanimous sentiment—that this is no time to make a public exhibition of our differences to Germany. If we are sincere in our efforts to have peace we can only get it by keeping the respect, at least, of those with whom we are now negotiating. But if our citizens, either thoughtlessly or otherwise, are intent upon showing and disclosing to the European countries that they need not be afraid, that our notes mean nothing, if we mean to assure them in advance that we do not want even to hurt their feelings, what respect have they or will they continue to have for our notes? If they know that we are merely indulging in sending notes and that there is no force or strength back of that diplomacy backed and sustained by a united Nation, I wonder and I ask how do you expect to get any different results than a disagreement, and thus you bring about the very thing you are trying to avoid and to save us from? If you want a real crisis, all that is necessary is to inform those foreign countries with whom we are now negotiating that, no matter what they do or say they need have

no fear; that we want peace; that we will talk and will not fight, no matter what the cause—in short, that they may work their will on us; that they are safe, no matter what they do!

A good many hundreds of our citizens have been sent to the bottom of the sea. Of course we have resented it and have protested against it, but many of our citizens thought that we should warn our people to keep off the sea. Here the other day a man was arrested with papers upon his person, it is reported, which indicate that he may be a party to the work that is going on, and immediately there is talk to the effect that Germany will break off relations with us because we arrested her man!

Part of the press of the United States and some of our citizens who had favored the warning of our own citizens thought Germany might have just cause for breaking diplomatic relations because of the arrest of a German subject. Is it more hazardous to put a citizen of a foreign country in jail than it is to send hundreds of American citizens down to the bottom of the sea?

I say that I want these letters and these telegrams referred to the appropriate committee. I should like to have a sample of each one put into the Record for the purpose of enabling other Members of Congress to compare theirs with these, in order to convince themselves of the fact that the protests came not from their people, but from an influence beyond their State.

I want to say now that my sole object in discussing the matter to-day is to call the attention of the country and the Senate to the things that are going on in this country. I for one can not look with complacency or tolerance on any movement that seeks to poison the people of this country against their own Government. This is no time for taking chances; and I for one think that this Government may well take notice of these movements that are going on, and follow them up to their poisonous sources. I do not believe that any respectable Government will want to admit that it is carrying on a propaganda in this country. If it is, however, this Government should stop it once and for all. This Government can not afford to suffer any foreign Government to incite or attempt to incite our people, and any such attempt, if attempt there is, should immediately and promptly be made an end of. I believe that this country should waste no time before trying to put its finger on the heart of this sinister activity.

We can only have one end eventually, no matter how many crises we may pass. We may pass this crisis, we may pass another crisis, and still another, and still a hundred more; but it must be plain to everybody that if this war continues for another year or two, and incidents like those of the past against our rights continue, it can lead only to one end. No person or influence or power can make our people continue indefinitely to endure it.

THE MAIN ISSUE.

We all want peace. I hope that as long as I am a Member of this body I may never have to vote for a declaration of war. I do not want to vote for any declaration of war. I want peace, and I know every other Senator in the Chamber wants peace. It is only a question of how you are going to keep it. How are you going to get it? Are you going to get it by permitting this kind of business to go on in this country, unrebuked and unpunished? Are you going to have peace by debating in an academic way who is doing us the most injury—the allies of Great Britain or the allies of Germany? Instead of considering the question of our rights as against Germany, the controversy seems to have shifted as to which of the two belligerents are doing us the greatest injury. Which of these combinations is doing its best to drive us into war; which of these countries is most—I will not say insolent—but most regardless of our rights; which one is trying to put the barb into us the deepest?

I say we have lost sight of the main issue and are engaging in academic discussions instead of digging out the main issue. And what is the main issue? At this time the main issue for our citizens is this: Are we right or are we wrong in our controversy with Germany, and are you with or are you against the United States? If we are right, can we afford to abandon the right and condone a wrong, or shall we admit that we are mistaken, even though we know we are right, and thus condone a wrong and repudiate our rights?

We must settle these things one at a time; and I want to take occasion in just a few words to state my position.

I am for the United States against Germany or Austria or Great Britain or Russia or France or Japan or Turkey or any other nation on the face of the earth when opposed to us; I do not care what they are or who they are. I want each and every nation to respect our rights, as we propose to respect theirs; and I will not conceal the fact that I was in hopes long ago that Germany would yield and recognize our rights, so that we might straightway and promptly turn our undivided attention to other flagrant violations of our rights on the part of other countries. I believe that Germany has been standing in her

own light. I believe that in her refusal to bow and yield to the rightful demands of the United States she has in a way hindered and obstructed herself, because I believe there is a sentiment in this country which is that we shall play no favorites, but defend our rights, no matter how or by whom invaded. There is also a belief prevailing in this country that as long as the lives of our citizens are the issue that must be settled first; and then, I say, I believe there is a further sentiment in this country that when that is settled, and settled right, we should turn our attention to those who are wronging us in other ways, and make them see the right also.

That is the attitude that I want to take in this body, and the attitude that I think is the proper and just and right one. In this controversy that lies nearest to our right hand I believe it is absolutely necessary, in order to convince Germany that we mean business, that the country as one man should put themselves back of a President who has used his talents, his genius, his time, his energy, and all his other qualities of hand and heart with which Nature has so richly endowed him, to keep us out of war and preserve our honor. I say such a President as that deserves the support, in my humble opinion, of the humblest citizen in the land, as well as that of every Senator in this body.

NOT SENTIMENT OF NATION.

Now, I have said that these hundreds of thousands of telegrams might have the effect of encouraging Germany to maintain its position and put us in a position where we must yield or break off diplomatic relations. I want to remind, however, those whom it may concern that the expressions of these telegrams in the main are not the spontaneous utterances of our people, but as it clearly appears from what has already been said these are merely the repetition of some force, by some "us," seeking to hinder, delay, and obstruct the peaceful negotiations of this country with Germany. These are, therefore, not in the main the expression of the sentiment of the people whose names are attached to these telegrams except in so far as they reflect the universal desire on the part of our countrymen for peace, but a peace that must be consistent with honor and with American traditions of preserving American lives and American rights.

Let no foreign nation be deluded or deceived into the belief that American citizens will not support their American Government always. Let every foreign country be duly advised that if the time should come, which God forbid, when the American Government must take a stand which may involve a breach of diplomatic relations or involve us in even worse than that, that America as one man will leap to the defense of our flag, to the defense of our Government, to the defense of the lives of our citizens and of our sacred honor.

MR. WORKS. Mr. President, I have received something over a hundred of the telegrams to which the Senator from Wisconsin has referred so feelingly. It had not occurred to me to take exception to the contents of the telegrams or to criticize the American citizens who sent them. My constituents in California have a perfect right to express their views to me upon any public question. I have never resented it at any time. So has any American citizen in any State of the Union the right to express his sentiments to me or any other Senator.

There is no question before the Senate now. This whole matter is in the hands of the executive department. That department is responsible for whatever may be done. Until it comes in proper course before Congress I myself have felt that it ought not to be agitated under the present conditions. I think the President of the United States should be left to determine what shall be done under existing conditions, and that the Congress of the United States should be free when any responsibility is cast upon it to deal with this matter independently and freely. I am, therefore, astonished that any Member of this body should make such a speech as we have just listened to.

Mr. President, this is a solemn occasion. Everyone who stops to think about it realizes that the situation is a delicate one and that something may happen at any time that would precipitate a most unfortunate conflict with one or the other of the belligerent nations. Certainly we, as representatives of the people of this Republic, should not aid by anything that we may say or do to agitate the public mind and bring about any such consequences.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have not felt it to be any part of my duty to bring these telegrams before the Senate. They come properly to me. I have no sense of criticism of the people who have sent them. It does not make any difference to me whether they have been sent voluntarily and without suggestion by any single citizen or whether they have been suggested by somebody else. I assume that whenever a citizen attaches his name to one of the telegrams he is expressing his own sentiments, no matter who suggests it to his mind.

I think, Mr. President, the conditions are such that a Senator might well be admonished, as the Senator from Wisconsin has admonished the people who sent these telegrams, that it is a good time to be silent until we are called upon to act and speak.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I had not intended to say a word upon this subject, but, in view of the discussion to which we have listened, I simply desire to say this: I have received four or five hundred of these telegrams. Their character was such that it was evident to the merest tyro they were sent from some inspired source.

I am always glad to hear from my constituents on every subject that is attracting the attention of the public. I am particularly pleased to hear from them when I know that their messages contain their real sentiments and that they are not the mere conveyors of the sentiments or thoughts which may inspire the breast of some one who is actuated by some ulterior purpose.

Mr. President, I very much regret this campaign for this reason: The method which has been adopted casts a suspicion upon the motive of the man who started it. Evidently the telegrams themselves indicate a purpose of hostility against this Government. A campaign of this kind can not serve either the cause of truth or the cause of peace. It is for that reason that I regret that it has been started.

I do not care to occupy the attention of the Senate further in this matter, except to express my disapproval of the methods which have been adopted by those who are back of the movement.

Mr. HUSTING. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will indulge me a moment in reply to the remark of the senior Senator from California [Mr. Works].

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Wisconsin permit me to suggest that this subject might well be left until after the close of morning business?

Mr. HUSTING. I shall take only a moment.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well; I shall not make any objection.

Mr. HUSTING. Mr. President, I merely wish to say in reply to the remark of the Senator from California, who admonishes me that my remarks may have been out of order, or, rather, not in place at this time, that, of course, as a younger Member of this body, I am glad many times to defer to the opinions of senior Members, but I do want to say further that the Senator from California has made remarks here in regard to this administration and this Government at other times that would have impelled me to admonish him if I considered it proper to admonish a Senator from another State, who, I take it, is primarily answerable for his conduct to his State and country.

I want to conclude by remarking that I have spoken at length this afternoon because I thought it high time to bring this movement out into the open air where it can best be treated, and that with all due deference to the senior Senator from California he will have to permit me as long as I am a Member of this body as the representative, in part, of a great State to exercise my own judgment as to the propriety of any action which I may take or of making any remarks which I choose to make within parliamentary limits.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I present a telegram on the same subject referred to by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING]. I do not ask to have it read, but that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The telegram is as follows:

MAYWOOD, ILL., April 24, 1916.

Hon. L. Y. SHERMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

If warlike rumors coming from Washington are true, will you let me reassure you that the great majority of your constituents stand for peace. Believe war now unnecessary and uncalled for, and will resent being participated into the European conflict.

CHARLES BROBERG,
1618 South Seventh Avenue.

Mr. SHERMAN. The telegram of itself is unobjectionable. It is the number and circumstances that are out of the ordinary.

If the Senate will indulge me for a few moments, I wish to say that I have on the same subject about 4,000 similar telegrams in my office. It is inexpedient to take much time this morning. The Senator from Wisconsin has gone into the matter at length, and to some degree he, as well as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], voices my sentiments.

These telegrams, under the conditions, I wish to say will not change in any manner my vote or my conduct in this body. The right of petition is a sacred one in a republican form of government and is respected by the Senate. This is evidenced by the time taken and the extreme liberality with which the Senate regards such communications.

But, Mr. President, the right of petition is always one that ought to present the volition as well as the initiative of the

petitioner. In my judgment, the great number of telegrams that have come to certain Members of the Senate do not represent either the initiative or the volition of the person signing such petitions or telegrams. They indicate, in my opinion, so far as I can collect evidence on that subject, the activities of the American Embargo Conference, which seeks to close the neutral markets of our country against the belligerents in the European war.

I probably will not suit either side on pending controversies relating to our foreign affairs. I shall vote, Mr. President, against closing our markets to the purchase of war supplies by any belligerents that can enter our markets and arrange satisfactory terms of purchase with our people. I do that because I wish to defend the rights of my own country to purchase in the markets of the world if we unfortunately are at war. The defense of the right to sell to belligerents as a neutral nation constitutes the defense of our right to buy when we are belligerents in a neutral market wherever it may be deemed advantageous to us.

I do not agree with many of the matters in which this administration is called on to act, but I regard the American Embargo Conference, which I regard as the responsible author of these communications, as having misplaced its activities. Whatever I may do hereafter in voting upon peace or war or in sustaining or opposing the administration, if it should break off its diplomatic relations with foreign powers, will be decided when it is reached, if unhappily it must. On any existing ground at this time I am opposed to war and shall vote for peace.

I am an American and a neutral, and so being neutral I deplore the ex parte activities of those who are not neutral in arousing this flood of petitions. The excitement caused among our people by such procedure is harmful to our neutrality and our continued domestic peace.

I wish to say, Mr. President, in the few moments that I shall take, that these communications are, in my judgment, an abuse of the right of petition. They are thrusting upon this body those communications in a way that is intended to be a menace and not a legitimate argument, and whatever my views may be, and to some degree I sympathize upon other questions with these petitioners or with those who are active in the American Embargo Conference, I regard these numerous petitions as not only a perversion of the right of petition, but as an unworthy menace upon the liberty of action and of judgment of the Senate, and to that degree I regret its occurrence.

MIGRATORY BIRD REGULATIONS.

I wish to offer further, Mr. President, upon another matter, a petition presented to me by certain citizens of the State of Illinois relating to the United States Biological Survey relative to a revision of the migratory bird regulations for Illinois, and I wish to add in addition a few words. I am aware with what relief it falls upon the Senate like a blessed benediction. I did it designedly in order that the tension might be relieved.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHERMAN. Just a moment, on the last petition I have presented.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator permit me to indulge the hope that we may proceed with the morning business in a very short time?

Mr. SHERMAN. Very well; I shall certainly take but a moment. The complaint of the petition is that the Biological Survey has interfered with the legitimate rights of a number of sportsmen in various rivers, either the Mississippi or the tributary rivers, and the complaint is upon that ground. They regard the bureau as having become somewhat ossified in its conduct and very dictatorial in its regulations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

ARMED MERCHANT SHIPS (S. DOC. NO. 420).

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have in my hand a statement issued by the State Department defining the attitude of the United States toward armed merchant ships in neutral ports and on the high seas. It was published in full in last night's Star. On account of the importance of the subject, I ask that it may be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRANDEGEE subsequently said: The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] asked to have printed as a document a moment ago the statement which was issued by the Department of State in relation to the question of armed merchantmen. I should like to ask that it be printed in the RECORD also. It is a statement from a department of the Government on a very important matter. While the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], from the Committee on Printing, usually objects to both these courses being taken, I am quite certain that it would be much

more serviceable if printed in the Record than printed as a document, and I hope he will waive his objection to both being done in this instance.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator that I understood the request of the Senator from Minnesota was that it be printed in the Record.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; that it be printed as a document. If I had had my way and could have made a suggestion to the Senator I would have asked him to request that it be printed in the Record, where it would have a much wider circulation.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator to defer his request until I confer with the Senator from Minnesota. I have no doubt he will agree to the suggestion.

Mr. LODGE. I thought the Senator from Minnesota asked that it might be printed in the Record.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator from Utah takes the ground that the Committee on Printing will not allow or does not advocate the printing in both the Record and as a document.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Printing, and that matter has never been before the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to state that the Joint Committee on Printing has time and again discussed the question as to whether matter should be printed in the Record and printed as a public document, and the position taken by the Joint Committee on Printing is that any particular article could be printed either in the Record or as a public document. If it is printed in the Record, it can be circulated exactly the same as a public document. It virtually becomes a public document, because it can be printed by itself or it can be taken as a part of the Record and sent through the mails in that way. That is the reason why the committee has taken this position. I believe it is the right one, and as long as I can object I am going to object.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I will say to the Senator that it seems to be purely a technical objection on his part, because anybody can read it into the Record, and it may as well be printed in the Record and not take up the time of the Senate to read it.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to printing it in the Record, I will say, if the Senator desires it.

Mr. NELSON. I have no objection to that course, but I want to have it printed also as a document.

Mr. LODGE. There is no reason why it should not be printed in both forms.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Does a single objection bar the request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To print in the Record?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I assume that a vote of the Senate could be taken on the question, but I hardly thought it was necessary to make a motion. I was simply asking the Senator from Utah to agree in this case that an important communication from the Department of State might be printed in the Record.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection, as far as the subject matter is concerned, to have it printed both ways, but I have been trying to be consistent in this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is very easy to settle the question. Is there objection to printing the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Minnesota requests that it be printed as a public document.

Mr. NELSON. That has already been ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that the Chair was asking whether it should be printed in the Record, and that it was not going to be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We can settle that question. All in favor of printing the article as a public document will say aye, contrary no. [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and it is so ordered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

A statement from the State Department defining the attitude of the United States toward armed merchant ships in neutral ports and on the high seas was made public to-day by the State Department by direction of President Wilson. It originally was prepared as a circular note to other powers, but it later was decided to issue it as a statement.

TEXT OF STATEMENT.

The statement is as follows:

"The status of an armed merchant vessel of a belligerent is to be considered from two points of view: First, from that of a neutral when the vessel enters its ports, and, second, from that of an enemy when the vessel is on the high seas.

"FIRST. AN ARMED MERCHANT VESSEL IN NEUTRAL PORTS.

"(1) It is necessary for a neutral government to determine the status of an armed merchant vessel of belligerent nationality which enters its jurisdiction in order that the Government may protect itself from responsibility for the destruction of life and property by permitting its ports to be used as bases of hostile operations by belligerent warships.

"(2) If the vessel carries a commission or orders issued by a belligerent government and directing it under penalty to conduct aggressive

operations, or if it is conclusively shown to have conducted such operations, it should be regarded and treated as a warship.

"(3) If sufficient evidence is wanting, a neutral government, in order to safeguard itself from liability for failure to preserve its neutrality, may reasonably presume from the facts the status of an armed merchant vessel which frequents its waters. There is no settled rule of international law as to the sufficiency of evidence to establish such a presumption. As a result a neutral government must decide for itself the sufficiency of the evidence which it requires to determine the character of the vessel. For the guidance of its port officers and other officials a neutral government may therefore declare a standard of evidence, but such standard may be changed on account of the general conditions of naval warfare or modified on account of the circumstances of a particular case. These changes and modifications may be made at any time during the progress of the war, since the determination of the status of an armed merchant vessel in neutral waters may affect the liability of a neutral government.

"SECOND. AN ARMED MERCHANT VESSEL ON HIGH SEAS.

"(1) It is necessary for a belligerent warship to determine the status of an armed merchant vessel of an enemy encountered on the high seas, since the rights of life and property of belligerents and neutrals on board the vessel may be impaired if its status is that of an enemy warship.

"(2) The determination of warlike character must rest in no case upon presumption, but upon conclusive evidence, because the responsibility for the destruction of life and property depends on the actual facts of the case and can not be avoided or lessened by a standard of evidence which a belligerent may announce as creating a presumption of hostile character. On the other hand, to safeguard himself from possible liability for unwarranted destruction of life and property the belligerent should, in the absence of conclusive evidence, act on the presumption that an armed merchantman is of peaceful character.

"(3) A presumption based solely on the presence of an armament on a merchant vessel of an enemy is not a sufficient reason for a belligerent to declare it to be a warship and proceed to attack it without regard to the rights of the persons on board. Conclusive evidence of a purpose to use the armament for aggression is essential. Consequently an armament which a neutral government, seeking to perform its neutral duties, may presume to be intended for aggression might, in fact, on the high seas be used solely for protection. A neutral government has no opportunity to determine the purpose of an armament on a merchant vessel unless there is evidence in the ship's papers or other proof as to its previous use, so that the government is justified in substituting an arbitrary rule of presumption in arriving at the status of the merchant vessel. On the other hand, a belligerent warship can on the high seas test by actual experience the purpose of an armament on an enemy merchant vessel and so determine by direct evidence the status of the vessel.

"SUMMARY OF CONTENTIONS.

"The status of an armed merchant vessel as a warship in neutral waters may be determined, in the absence of documentary proof or conclusive evidence of previous aggressive conduct, by presumption derived from all the circumstances of the case.

"The status of such vessel as a warship on the high seas must be determined only upon conclusive evidence of aggressive purpose, in the absence of which it is to be presumed that the vessel has a private and peaceable character, and it should be so treated by an enemy warship.

"In brief, a neutral government may proceed upon the presumption that an armed merchant vessel of belligerent nationality is armed for aggression, while a belligerent should proceed on the presumption that the vessel is armed for protection. Both of these presumptions may be overcome by evidence—the first by secondary or collateral evidence, since the fact to be established is negative in character; the second by primary and direct evidence, since the fact to be established is positive in character."

II.

The character of the evidence upon which the status of an armed merchant vessel of belligerent nationality is to be determined when visiting neutral waters and when traversing the high seas having been stated, it is important to consider the rights and duties of neutrals and belligerents as affected by the status of armed merchant vessels in neutral ports and on the high seas.

"FIRST. THE RELATIONS OF BELLIGERENTS AND NEUTRALS AS AFFECTED BY THE STATUS OF ARMED MERCHANT VESSELS IN NEUTRAL PORTS.

"(1) It appears to be the established rule of international law that warships of a belligerent may enter neutral ports and accept limited hospitality there upon condition that they leave, as a rule, within 24 hours after their arrival.

"(2) Belligerent warships are also entitled to take on fuel once in three months in ports of a neutral country.

"(3) As a mode of enforcing these rules a neutral has the right to cause belligerent warships failing to comply with them, together with their officers and crews, to be interned during the remainder of the war.

"(4) Merchantmen of belligerent nationality, armed only for purposes of protection against the enemy, are entitled to enter and leave neutral ports without hindrance in the course of legitimate trade.

"(5) Armed merchantmen of belligerent nationality under a commission or orders of their government to use, under penalty, their armament for aggressive purposes, or merchantmen which, without such commission or orders, have used their armaments for aggressive purposes, are not entitled to the same hospitality in neutral ports as peaceable armed merchantmen.

"SECOND. THE RELATIONS OF BELLIGERENTS AND NEUTRALS AS AFFECTED BY THE STATUS OF ARMED MERCHANT VESSELS ON THE HIGH SEAS.

"(1) Innocent neutral property on the high seas can not legally be confiscated, but is subject to inspection by a belligerent. Resistance to inspection removes this immunity and subjects the property to condemnation by a prize court, which is charged with the preservation of the legal rights of the owners of neutral property.

"(2) Neutral property engaged in contraband trade, breach of blockade, or unneutral service obtains the character of enemy property and is subject to seizure by a belligerent and condemnation by a prize court.

"(3) When hostile and innocent property is mixed, as in the case of a neutral ship carrying a cargo which is entirely or partly contraband, this fact can only be determined by inspection. Such innocent property may be of uncertain character, as it has been frequently held that it is more or less contaminated by association with hostile property. For example, under the declaration of London (which, so far as the provisions covering this subject are concerned, has been adopted

by all the belligerents) the presence of a cargo which in bulk or value consists of 50 per cent contraband articles impresses the ship with enemy character and subjects it to seizure and condemnation by a prize court.

"HAVE THE RIGHT TO ARM."

"(4) Enemy property, including ships and cargoes, is always subject to seizure and condemnation. Any enemy property taken by a belligerent on the high seas is a total loss to the owners. There is no redress in a prize court. The only means of avoiding loss is by flight or successful resistance. Enemy merchant ships have therefore the right to arm for the purpose of self-protection.

"(5) A belligerent warship is any vessel which, under commission or orders of its Government imposing penalties or entitling it to prize money, is armed for the purpose of seeking and capturing or destroying enemy property or hostile neutral property on the seas. The size of the vessel, strength of armament, and its defensive or offensive force are immaterial.

"(6) A belligerent warship has, incidental to the right of seizure, the right to visit and search all vessels on the high seas for the purpose of determining the hostile or innocent character of the vessels and their cargoes. If the hostile character of the property is known, however, the belligerent warship may seize the property without exercising the right of visit and search, which is solely for the purpose of obtaining knowledge as to the character of the property. The attacking vessel must display its colors before exercising belligerent rights.

"(7) When a belligerent warship meets a merchantman on the high seas which is known to be enemy owned and attempts to capture the vessel, the latter may exercise its right of self-protection either by flight or by resistance. The right to capture and the right to prevent capture are recognized as equally justifiable.

"RIGHT OF CAPTURE LIMITED."

"(8) The exercise of the right of capture is limited, nevertheless, by certain accepted rules of conduct based on the principles of humanity and regard for innocent property, even if there is definite knowledge that some of the property, cargo as well as the vessel, is of enemy character. As a consequence of these limitations, it has become the established practice for warships to give merchant vessels an opportunity to surrender or submit to visit and search before attempting to seize them by force. The observance of this rule of naval warfare tends to prevent the loss of life of noncombatants and the destruction of innocent neutral property which would result from sudden attack.

"(9) If, however, before a summons to surrender is given a merchantman of belligerent nationality, aware of the approach of an enemy warship, uses its armament to keep the enemy at a distance, or after it has been summoned to surrender it resists or flees, the warship may properly exercise force to compel surrender.

"(10) If the merchantman finally surrenders, the belligerent warship may release it or take it into custody. In the case of an enemy merchantman it may be sunk, but only if it is impossible to take it into port, and provided always that the persons on board are put in a place of safety. In the case of a neutral merchantman the right to sink it in any circumstance is doubtful.

"(11) A merchantman entitled to exercise the right of self-protection may do so when certain of attack by an enemy warship; otherwise the exercise of the right would be so restricted as to render it ineffectual. There is a distinct difference, however, between the exercise of the right of self-protection and the act of cruising the seas in an armed vessel for the purpose of attacking enemy naval vessels.

"WHEN THEY LOSE STATUS."

"(12) In the event that merchant ships of belligerent nationality are armed and under commission or orders to attack in all circumstances certain classes of enemy naval vessels for the purpose of destroying them, and are entitled to receive prize money for such service from their Government or are liable to a penalty for failure to obey the orders given, such merchant ships lose their status as peaceable merchant ships and are to a limited extent incorporated in the naval forces of their Government, even though it is not their sole occupation to conduct hostile operations.

"(13) A vessel engaged intermittently in commerce and under a commission or orders of its Government imposing a penalty, in pursuing and attacking enemy naval craft, possesses a status tainted with a hostile purpose which it can not throw aside or assume at will. It should, therefore, be considered as an armed public vessel and receive the treatment of a warship by an enemy and by neutrals. Any person taking passage on such a vessel can not expect immunity other than that accorded persons who are on board a warship. A private vessel engaged in seeking enemy naval craft, without such a commission or orders from its Government, stands in a relation to the enemy similar to that of a civilian who fires upon the organized military forces of a belligerent, and is entitled to no more considerate treatment."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. ROBINSON, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 3069) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,'" approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission," approved March 4, 1915, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 394) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3794) for the relief of Thomas S. Johnson, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 393) thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD, For the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], who is detained from the Senate, I report from the Committee on Commerce the bill (S. 4760) to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Normania* to *William F. Stifel*, and I submit a report (No. 400) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

S. 3618. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to subdivide the southeast quarter of section 18, township 46 north, range 4 west, Boise meridian (the same being that portion of the town site of Plummer, Benewah County, Idaho, not yet platted), into 5-acre tracts for sale, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 398); and

S. 4287. A bill to grant unsurveyed islands to the State of Minnesota for forestry purposes (Rept. No. 399).

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 3617. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Davis (Rept. No. 395); and

H. R. 7804. An act to authorize the issuance of patent to Oscar R. Howard, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 397).

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 113) for the relief of Fred White, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 396) thereon.

G. B. DICKSON.

Mr. MYERS. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 8067) to quiet the title to certain lands in the possession of G. B. Dickson, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 392) thereon.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of that bill. My physical condition is such that I have been unable to be in the Senate for the last few days, and after to-day I expect to be absent for some time. I should like to have the bill disposed of before leaving the city. It is a private bill, and of no great importance, except to the claimant.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the bill be read, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue a patent in fee to that portion of land, the title of which is now in the United States of America, comprised in section 16, township 14 north, range 6 east, in the county of Craighead, State of Arkansas, to G. B. Dickson, the present occupant of the land, upon proof by him that there are no adverse claimants and that he has continuously occupied the land since January 1, 1882.

Mr. ROBINSON. If unanimous consent be given for the present consideration of the bill, I desire to offer an amendment which has been suggested, namely, after the word "land," in line 10, to insert the words "in person or by tenant." This is done to relieve the bill from the possibility of ambiguity. I do not think the amendment is necessary, but it has been thought to be so by others.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. How will the bill read if amended as proposed by the Senator from Arkansas?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the language as proposed to be amended.

The SECRETARY. If amended as proposed by the Senator from Arkansas, the language will read:

And that he has continuously occupied the land in person or by tenant since January 1, 1882.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 5770) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War," approved April 19, 1908; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5771) for the relief of Sylvester P. Hill (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 5772) to provide for the sinking of artesian wells, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 5773) for the relief of G. W. Kates; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 5774) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad to their employees in certain cases," approved April 22, 1908, and amended April 5, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 5775) granting a pension to J. A. Swaim; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 5776) to amend certain public-utility company franchises in the Territory of Hawaii; and

A bill (S. 5777) to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric light and power within the Lihue district and the Koloa district, county of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 5778) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Boswell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 5779) granting a pension to Alonson V. Dean (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 5780) granting an increase of pension to Kate K. Henry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A bill (S. 5781) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce"; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 5782) granting a pension to Delia L. Trask (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. RANDELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the rivers and harbors appropriation bill (H. R. 12193), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 to enable the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the existence of artesian water and other underground water supplies suitable for irrigation in the arid and semiarid portions of northern Montana, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RURAL CREDITS.

Mr. STERLING submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2986) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgage, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to create Government depositaries and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

GLIMPSES OF OUR NATIONAL PARKS.

Mr. SAULSBURY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 180), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the Public Printer be, and he is hereby, authorized and instructed to cause to be printed 1,000 copies, for the use of each Senator, of National Park Service bulletin known as "Glimpses of our National Parks."

RURAL CREDITS.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Saturday next, the 29th instant, following the routine morning business, I shall address the Senate on the pending Federal farm-loan bill.

GOOD ROADS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7617, commonly known as the good-roads bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that in order to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways, the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads which may be

used in the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], it seems to me, is an eminently sensible one. It has met with an opposition which is very illuminating in regard to the main purposes of this bill. The Senator from Ohio described the character of roads with which we are all extremely familiar—we can see them by going a very few miles from this Capitol—roads which are annually repaired by the town or the county or the neighborhood. The repairing consists in digging out in springtime the washings of the winter on either side, piling them up in the middle of the road, and putting the road in such condition that it is fairly open to travel for that locality during the summer and autumn seasons. The work has no permanent quality whatever; it does not mean the building of good roads in any sense by the production of something permanent, while the purpose of this bill ought to be the development of good highways and main traveled roads extending between different States; that is, it should have a national character, a real value to all the people of the United States, who have to pay the bill. But this bill is a proposition to get the United States to dump in a certain amount of money annually for the temporary improvement of some local road—very local—which has no part in the great system of highways throughout the country. It is exactly like expecting the United States to come into a town which is not very well off to spend money to remove the snow or the mud in the spring, or something of that kind. This kind of temporary work has no relation to the building of good roads, as properly understood.

The opposition to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio, as I have said, illustrates what I have felt from the beginning from an examination of this bill—that its primary purpose is the distribution of a large sum of money from the Treasury of the United States among deserving States and deserving voters.

I am as heartily in favor of good roads and of everything that can be done to develop good roads as anyone can possibly be. I have supported the development of good roads in my own State, and the State has done an immense work in building good roads. We have already resurfaced and put in splendid condition over half the roads in the State. For that very reason I dislike very much to see \$75,000,000, a large sum of money even for this country, taken out of the United States Treasury and spent nominally on roads, with results so trifling, even if we assume that the money will be spent in the best possible way, that this great amount should be practically wasted.

Take this amount with which we are dealing and make some comparisons. The State of New York has spent \$82,000,000 on its roads. It has a total road mileage of 80,000 miles, in round numbers, and by the expenditure of \$82,000,000 it has improved, put in proper condition, and made really good roads of 22,000 miles, 27 per cent of the roads of New York. To improve those roads alone within the boundaries of the State of New York, 22,000 miles in length, the State has spent \$82,000,000, and we are asked to improve the roads of the United States with an expenditure of \$75,000,000.

The roads of the United States, in round numbers, represent 2,227,000 miles, and if this money is spent upon them in the best possible way—and a large part of it will undoubtedly be wasted—it would not affect 1 per cent or one-tenth of 1 per cent of the roads in the United States; and yet it is an enormous sum of money to take out of the United States Treasury, especially at a time when we need the money of the United States for other and, to my mind, far more important purposes, and at a time when the expenditures in all directions are very heavy.

The \$75,000,000 if spent in the best possible way, as I have said, will accomplish little or nothing so far as the roads of the United States as a whole are concerned; but, Mr. President, we begin by taking 15 per cent of the money, about \$11,000,000, I presume, and expending it on another bureau, to build up another great administrative department here in Washington.

We are overridden with bureaus now. We are creating so many, and we have so many, that the practical administration of the country is passing rapidly into their hands. They control Congress. By that I mean, for instance—to give an example which I have used before, and which I will use again—we have five surveys going on in this country, in many cases duplicating the work. An effort was made some years ago to

try to consolidate these surveys and save money to the country, but it was perfectly useless; the bureaus hopelessly beat those back of the effort, both in the Senate and in the other House, although we could get better work and save much money to the Government by organizing them purely on a business basis. This has been demonstrated here in regard to those surveys in past years, not once, but again and again. The late Senator from Colorado, Mr. Wolcott, a very brilliant Senator and a very brilliant man, devoted years to making a fight on the subject of the surveys, but gave it up in absolute despair because we were so controlled by the bureaus here in Washington.

We have at least three navies—I think four, perhaps; but certainly three. We have the Navy of the United States; we have the Coast and Geodetic Survey with a little navy; we have the Coast Guard Service with a little navy; and I think the Army has a little navy of its own. Attempts were made years ago, when I first came to Congress, to bring those naval forces under one head. It would, of course, have been infinitely better in administration, and it also would have strengthened our naval forces in time of war. Even then, as many years ago as that, the effort was hopelessly beaten by the bureaus.

Now, it is proposed to build up a new great bureau here to spend money on good roads. As a trifling beginning, \$11,000,000, I believe, in five years is to be devoted to the purposes of administration—a mere nothing. Mr. President, if you inaugurate the system of appropriations provided by this bill, the fact that will impress the States and the people who receive it will be that the amount is so small that it does not really do any good; but you will have taught them to come to the United States Government for money to do the work which they ought to do themselves, and you will still further destroy the spirit of local self-government, the spirit of independence of the States in their own field of action. Appetite will grow by what it feeds upon, and out of this \$75,000,000 which it is proposed to give to the States as a beginning will come annual appropriations which will make the worst river and harbor bill we ever had look wan and pale and slight and attenuated in comparison. It will reach such a point, when you once hold out to the people of the States that they can get money here in Washington, that they will come here with clamors, which can not be resisted, and this \$75,000,000 will look like a trifle, a bagatelle; and yet \$75,000,000 taken out of the Treasury is a huge sum of money to be added to the expenditures of the present time, some of which are vital.

Mr. President, the maintenance of a road is quite as important, if not more important, than the original building of the road. If you have a bad road and spend no money on it, you fail to get a good road, and save your money; that is all; but if you spend a good deal of money on a road and do not maintain it, you have lost an immense amount of money and still have a bad road. There is no sufficient provision in this bill for the maintenance of the roads. The clauses in regard to maintenance are slack, and it does not seem to me that those supporting this bill can possibly understand what the maintenance of a road means.

Of course it is sheer waste to spend money on a road, as is proposed by those who oppose the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, in digging out the spring washings and piling them into the middle of the road. That is not maintenance; that is temporary repair; but to keep the road really a good road, really a main traveled road, a national highway, it must be attended to constantly.

We have 8,000 miles of as good roads in Massachusetts as I have met with anywhere in the world. I have traveled on the beautiful roads of France and England and elsewhere, as well as in this country, and I know of no better roads than the State roads of my own State. They are extremely expensive to build. They cost \$10,000 a mile, and if you double the width—as is the case in some places—\$20,000 a mile. But the average running cost of the State roads is \$10,000 a mile, built with tar, crushed stone, gravel, and so forth. Those roads cost \$800,000 a year to maintain; that is, to keep the whole system up to the condition in which it was when first built involves an expenditure, on an average, of a thousand dollars a mile a year. I do not mean, of course, that a thousand dollars is spent on each of the 8,000 miles every year. The road will go for many years without needing repairs, and then you will have to spend two or three thousand dollars a mile on it; but, on an average, it costs a thousand dollars a mile a year to keep those roads in Massachusetts in proper order, and there is not any provision made in this bill sufficient to insure the maintenance of a road in the condition in which it will be when the Government money has been spent on it.

One last point, Mr. President, which I think is to be considered, but which is not likely to have much effect in the votes against the bill, because it represents only injustice to a minority.

It is always a pleasant thing to get something for nothing. There is no money so easy, so agreeable to spend as other people's money, and it is the money that is most surely wasted. Now, the State of Massachusetts—I will take my own State to illustrate—out of the last \$25,000,000 to be expended under this bill will receive \$380,000, and she will pay in taxes, based on the direct taxes levied by the Government, \$1,400,000. Of that \$25,000,000 the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Massachusetts, and I think New Jersey—those five States—will pay half. Now, that is pleasant for the other States, but it is extremely unjust to the States from which the money is taken. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] said the other day that New York was a rich State, and ought to pay for her own roads and pay for other people's roads because it is a rich State. That seems to me a strange doctrine, Mr. President. The framers of the Constitution of the United States took great pains to endeavor to make taxation as equal as possible, and the fact that one State has more money than another or is more prosperous than another is no reason why that State should pay the bills of the less prosperous States; but that is just what this bill does.

Let me take as an illustration the emergency-tax receipts for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915. The total amount collected in the United States, in round numbers, was \$52,000,000. Thirty-one million of the \$52,000,000 was paid by Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Twenty-one million of the \$52,000,000 was paid by the other 40 States. Those are direct taxes, falling on articles of consumption in the form of stamp taxes. We have no complaint to make about paying those taxes if our consumption and our use of stamps justifies it; but when you go beyond that and make us pay also for roads in distant parts of the country, under a bill from which we get no real benefit, it seems to me that it is extreme injustice, and I do not believe that laws rooted in injustice can or ought to prevail in the United States.

The first year of this bill my State will receive \$76,000 in order to improve its roads. Mr. President, the annual expenditure for roads of Massachusetts by the State—which is over two million—counties, and towns is \$6,600,000, and we are keeping our roads up not only for our own benefit but for the benefit of the whole country. New England is the great point of travel all through the summer, and those roads are open to the world free of charge. We get a reward no doubt in the travelers who are attracted by the fine roads, but none the less we are paying \$6,600,000 a year to build those roads. Now the United States comes along and offers to give us \$76,000 as an installment of five-year payments, and at the end of five years we shall have received \$1,100,000 and paid to the Government \$2,800,000. I really do not see why that money should be taken from us, because we pay a larger share of taxes than 40 other States.

These figures are used merely to illustrate what I consider the inherent injustice of the bill. That, as I have said, will have, I suppose, little or no effect on the vote of the Senate, but I wish to enter them as my protest against an injustice. The most serious objection, however, to the bill is, to my mind, that it will in no way advance the cause which we all have at heart. It will be a prodigious waste of Government money, with no corresponding result.

It is not as if we could spend \$75,000,000 in five years in building certain great trunk lines of road through the country in different directions, as in the old days of internal improvements, when they built the great Cumberland Road, I think it was, over the mountains. That was a national improvement, and gave the whole country a great artery of commerce, and all the States, whether they benefited by it directly or not, or whether they paid a larger share of money or not, were ready and willing to contribute their full part to the construction of the road. But this is a proposal to take the money paid by a few States—in its result, that is where it comes out—in the form of a huge sum of money from the National Treasury, and then scatter it about in small sums here and there, helping a bit of local road here and another bit there, ninety-nine one-hundredths of the value being only to the immediate locality, of no national value whatsoever. This huge sum is to be taken for that purpose.

I think I am justified in saying that the primary purpose of this bill is the distribution of money from the United States Treasury, to be distributed, no doubt, to deserving localities and deserving voters; but the result in good roads will be negligible. It will keep a good many people busy, I have no doubt; and, if I may return for a moment to what I said at the beginning, it will stimulate the appetite for appropriations which are for local purposes, the appropriations which go where the votes are lying thickest. Already they are a terrific drain on the

United States. Now you are opening up another source of drain on the Treasury which will go beyond anything that ever has been undertaken. The river and harbor bill will be nothing to it. The public-buildings bill will be nothing to it. Before you get through with this business, the Panama Canal will look like a cheap enterprise; because, if the people in the various localities once see that they are getting money from the Treasury of the United States, the demand will come up to Congressmen and to Senators that they must have more and ever more money for roads, and they will all get together in order to get the money for the roads, for with the roads go votes; and the bill will assume proportions which will stagger even the wealth of the United States.

It is to my mind most dangerous legislation in that way. It is entering on these vast expenditures without any thought of the future, and with results in the direction at which the bill is supposed to aim which will be perfectly trivial. There is an idea abroad—all of us must have seen it in our correspondence and elsewhere—there is an idea abroad in many localities that you can take money out of the United States Treasury, and that it is like a conjurer picking silver dollars out of the air. Nobody has to pay it; that seems to be the idea. Our taxes are laid on the theory that they must not hurt anybody. We try to impose the taxes where the votes are fewest, which makes a clumsy, ill-balanced, bad system, without any regard for the laws of economy or sound taxation; and our expenditures, as I have said, are based on the exactly opposite doctrine of spending the money where the votes are lying thickest.

I am no crazy economist. I never have been. I always have believed in liberal but intelligent Government expenditures. But we are now plunging into a course of expenditure, apart from those which we must make for the defense, the protection, and the government of the country, which are colossal, outrunning anything that ever has been dreamed of before. I think some of these expenditures for the present time at least can well wait; but I believe this bill is unsound economically, I believe it will do no good to the roads, and I believe it is going to end in a frightful waste of the money of the United States, which is all taken out of the pockets of the people sooner or later. You can not devise a tax that does not end by being distributed among all the people of the country, and the money which you are spending from the United States Treasury will all come out of the people. It will seem to the States that get \$3 for one that they are profiting at the expense of the States that are getting \$1 for three; but the net result will be a tremendous drain on the Treasury of the United States, and there is nothing in this bill that can ever justify the expenditure. You never will get out of this bill and out of an expenditure of \$75,000,000 any result except a trivial one, although the draft on the Treasury is so huge.

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is now within two minutes of 2 o'clock, when this bill must be laid aside. I simply want to say to the Senate that I shall not ask the Senate to consider this bill during the morning hour to-morrow or next day, in order that we may have a little time for the calendar and other matters; but I hope that on Monday the Senate will resume the consideration of this bill and make some disposition of it as soon as possible.

I desire to ask, Mr. President, for a reprint of the bill, including, of course, the amendments which have been agreed to by the Senate, in order that we may have that before us when we next consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PITTMAN in the chair). Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. GALLINGER. And the Senator will have the amendments printed either in brackets or in italics, so that they can be distinguished?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I should like to have that done.

Mr. POMERENE. May I suggest also that that order may include the pending amendments—the proposed amendments—so that they may be before the Senators?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The suggestion I made was that the reprint should include the amendments that have been adopted. The Senator's amendment is printed, and is here on everybody's desk.

Mr. POMERENE. The bill, of course, could be so printed as to indicate those which had been adopted and those which were proposed and pending.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator's amendment is the only one that is pending.

Mr. POMERENE. Is it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should not like to include that in the bill which we are printing to show the amendments that have been agreed to.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if the chairman of the committee will let me make a suggestion, the amendments which have been adopted could be put in italics, and if the Senator wants his amendment to appear in the print, it could then be incorporated in brackets.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Really, I do not see any necessity for including that in a reprint of the bill to show the amendments, when the amendment has not been adopted.

Mr. POMERENE. My only object was this, that while this amendment was being discussed a good many Senators were absent.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is on every Senator's table, Mr. President.

Mr. POMERENE. I hope Senators have seen it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no doubt that they have read it. I would rather not have the reprint include amendments that have not been agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. Well, all right.

The order as agreed to was reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That the bill (H. R. 7617) "An act to promote agriculture * * * and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways, etc.," be printed showing the bill as reported in italics; the part to be omitted in line type; new matter agreed to in small capitals; and the pending amendment in bold-face type.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMOOT. I am going to ask a question, and then I will yield. Has the unfinished business been laid before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that there was an agreement that the Senate should go into executive session at 2 o'clock to-day.

Mr. HOLLIS. That is perfectly true. I was going to suggest that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate, and then I shall make the motion.

Mr. SMOOT. It comes up automatically at 2 o'clock.

RURAL CREDITS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2986) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgage, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to create Government depositaries and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLIS. I ask unanimous consent that the rural-credits bill be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be the order.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HOLLIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Senate proceeds to the consideration of executive business. The Sergeant at Arms will clear the galleries and close the doors.

The Senate thereupon proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 3 hours and 30 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. HOLLIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, April 28, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 27, 1916.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Ensign Alfred T. Clay to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Jay K. Esler to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Eugene P. A. Simpson to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Herbert G. Gates, jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Alexander W. Loder to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Asst. Naval Constructor Robert B. Hilliard to be a naval constructor.

Asst. Naval Constructor Lee S. Border to be a naval constructor.

Gunner Alvin E. Skinner to be a chief gunner.

The following-named assistant surgeons of the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy to be assistant surgeons:

John Harper,

Richard H. Miller,

Paul Richmond, jr.,

Forrest M. Harrison,

Lawrence F. Drumm,

George W. Taylor,

Walter A. Vogelsang,

Elphege A. M. Gendreau,

Grover C. Wilson,

Russell J. Trout, and

Virgil H. Carson.

Chaplain Hugh M. T. Pearce, with rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to be a chaplain in the Navy with rank of lieutenant.

John A. Nelson to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Alfred J. Toulon to be a passed assistant surgeon.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

L. L. Ferrall, Grand Canyon.

W. B. Kelly, Clifton.

CALIFORNIA.

Ardella F. Brown, Walnut Grove.

Virginia Mason, Suisun City.

H. E. Meyers, Yuba City.

ILLINOIS.

Thomas W. Daly, Witt.

Frank Johnston, Charleston.

KANSAS.

George W. Long, Galena.

MAINE.

Theresa L. Higgins, Woodland.

Silas T. Lawry, Fairfield.

MISSISSIPPI.

Jefferson D. Fogg, Hernando.

NEBRASKA.

J. R. Cooper, Holdrege.

NEW YORK.

Michael Daly, Rye.

B. F. Lent, Ithaca.

Robert A. Lundy, Ray Brook.

James McNamara, Ravena.

Garrett D. Roche, Perry.

George Sinnott, Tarrytown.

Fred G. Worden, Lake George.

Llewellyn W. Yawger, Union Springs.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate April 27, 1916.

EXCISE BOARD, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Robert G. Smith to be a member of the Excise Board for the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 27, 1916.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We wait upon Thee, our Father in heaven, with open minds and hearts for the inspiration of Thy spirit, that with clear vision, honest hearts, and patriotic devotion our sacred rights and hallowed traditions may be subverted.

We are confronted ever and anon by the civil, political, and religious rights of freemen; plutocracy and democracy are the opposing forces, each striving for supremacy. "No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye can not serve God and mammon." Help us to serve Thee with all our mind, heart, and strength, under the spiritual leadership of the Prince of Men, who died for the liberty of all mankind. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SAFETY OF EMPLOYEES AND TRAVELERS UPON RAILROADS.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, there is reported from the Senate a bill in regard to a minimum fine for violations of the act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads. That bill is on the Speaker's table. There is a House bill, reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of the same purport.

The SPEAKER. What is the number of the Senate bill?

Mr. DEWALT. I do not have the Senate bill number. The number of the House bill is 9132. We desire to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Yes; but the main thing is to find the Senate bill, and it would be easier if you had the number.

Mr. DEWALT. I will defer it, then, until I can get the number.

The SPEAKER. It will be necessary, first, to secure unanimous consent, anyway, because the Senate bill came over here before the House bill was put on the calendar. The Senate bill is No. 3769, an act to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907. Is that it?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes, sir; that is it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 3769 and consider it now.

Mr. MANN. The House bill that the gentleman refers to was reported to the House only yesterday. I would like to have a chance to look over it. I hope the gentleman will postpone his request until to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. MANN. No; I do not object.

Mr. DEWALT. I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker, at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraws his request.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HEATON, for one week, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. SMITH of Texas, for two days, on account of illness.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12717, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12717, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12717) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Office of Markets and Rural Organization: One chief of office, \$4,500; 1 chief clerk, \$2,000; 1 administrative assistant, \$1,980; 5 clerks, class 4; 8 clerks, class 3; 14 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, \$1,380; 1 clerk, \$1,320; 20 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, \$1,140; 10 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 clerk, \$1,080; 10 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 clerk, \$840; 2 clerks, at \$720 each; 1 mechanical assistant, \$1,800; 1 mechanical assistant, \$1,380; 3 laboratory aids, at \$900 each; 4 laboratory aids, at \$720 each; 2 laboratory aids, at \$600 each; 1 photographer, \$1,400; 1 photographer, \$1,200; 1 telegraph operator, \$1,400; 1 telegraph operator, \$1,200; 1 map tracer, \$900; 1 map tracer, \$720; 1 map tracer, \$600; 1 map tracer, \$480; 1 laborer, \$720; 1 laborer, \$660; 4 messenger boys or laborers, at \$600 each; 4 messenger boys or laborers, at \$540 each; 2 messenger boys or laborers, at \$480 each; 1 messenger boy, \$420; 2 charwomen, at \$480 each; 1 charwoman, \$300; 2 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$129,880.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, we can sometimes best understand the purpose of legislation if we make a practical application of its expected results, and I hope you will pardon me for giving this little incident. There was a large cotton farmer in my district who raised home supplies. On one occasion he planted 20 acres in turnips, arranging with a commission house in Macon to ship and sell wherever he could find a market. When he was shipping his turnips he stopped at a store in a